

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 – 15, 17, 20, 21, 23 – 30, 32, 33, 35 – 38, 40, 41, 43 and 45 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 20, 28, 36 and 41 are independent.

In the present response the claims are not amended.

35 U.S.C. §103

Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) the Office rejects claims 1, 6, 14, 15, 20, 28, 35, 36, 40 and 45 over Young (US 2005/0169292) in view of Choi (US 2004/0264428).

Applicants submit that for at least the following reasons, claims 1, 6, 14, 15, 20, 28, 35, 36, 40 and 45 are patentable over Young and Choi, either singly or in combination.

For example, claim 1, in part, requires:

“beaconing according to a distributed Ultra WideBand Medium Access Control (UWB MAC) protocol by the host and the at least one connected device.”

In the Office Action, pages 2 – 3, the Office alleged that Young, paragraph [0026], discloses IEEE 802.15.3 standard under which Ultra WideBand Medium Access Control protocol falls. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants submit that IEEE 802.15.3 standard (IEEE Std 802.15.3-2003) does not include the above claimed distributed Ultra WideBand Medium Access Control (UWB MAC) protocol. Furthermore, as disclosed by Young, paragraph [0004], the wireless systems involved are based on a centralized topology. Thus, the protocol used in Young is not a distributed UWB MAC protocol. Therefore, Young fails to disclose the above claimed features.

In addition, claim 1, in part, requires:

“wherein an offset field and a duration field in a Distributed Reservation Protocol (DRP) are set to a multiple of a predetermined value if distributed reservation is supported.”

In the Office Action, the Office conceded that Young does not disclose reservations are set to a multiple of a predetermined value. However, the Office cited Choi, and alleged that Choi, paragraph [0048] discloses the above claimed feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Choi, paragraph [0048], discloses that the reservation information includes an association ID, a start time, and the number of time slots indicating how many time slots data are to be transmitted. However, Choi does not disclose that the start time is a multiple of any predetermined value. Thus, Applicants submit that Choi only discloses how many time slots data are to be transmitted, but does not disclose that the offset field is set to a multiple of a predetermined value. Therefore, Choi fails to cure the defects present in Young because Choi also fails to teach or suggest the above claimed features.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Young and Choi, either singly or in combination.

Similarly, independent claim 20, in part, requires:

“start beaconing according to a distributed Ultra WideBand Medium Access Control (UWB MAC) protocol and announce host capabilities,” and

“wherein the controller directs the device data transfer processing component to set an offset field and a duration field in each DRP reservation to a multiple of a predetermined value if distributed reservation is supported.”

Independent claim 28, in part, also requires:

“beaconing according to a distributed Ultra WideBand Medium Access Control (UWB MAC) protocol by the host and the at least one connected device” and

“wherein an offset field and a duration field in a Distributed Reservation Protocol (DRP) are set to a multiple of a predetermined value if distributed reservation is supported.”

Independent claim 36, in part, requires:

“beaconing according to a distributed Ultra WideBand Medium Access Control (UWB) MAC protocol by the host and the at least one connected device.”

Furthermore, independent claim 41, in part, also requires:

“beaconing according to a distributed Ultra WideBand Medium Access Control (UWB MAC) protocol by the host and the at least one connected device.”

Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments for claim 1 and apply them to claims 20, 28, 36 and 41, pointing out why claims 20, 28, 36 and 41 are patentable over Young and Choi.

Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) the Office rejects claims 4, 7 – 10, 12, 21, 24, 25, 33, 37, 38, 41 and 43 over Young, in view of Choi, further in view of Gu et al. (US 2005/0052995), hereinafter Gu; and claims 3, 13, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 32 over Young, in view of Choi, and further in view of IEEE Std 802.15.3-2003, hereinafter IEEE.

Applicants submit that neither Gu nor IEEE can cure the defects present in Young and Choi as discussed above. Each dependent claim includes at least the above mentioned features of claims 1, 20, 28, 36 and 41, as well as additional distinguishing features. Therefore, dependent claims are also patentable.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6 – 15, 17, 20, 21, 23 – 30, 32, 33, 35 – 38, 40, 41, 43 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection and rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Hay Yeung Cheung/
Hay Yeung Cheung
Registration No.: 56,666
Myers Wolin, LLC
Phone: (973) 401-7151

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001